

UNCLASSIFIED

b

Copy
RM L9J13a

NACA RM L9J13a

H46-3
50
C.2

NACA

RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

THE PATH AND MOTION OF SCALE MODELS OF JETTISONABLE NOSE
SECTIONS AT SUPERSONIC SPEEDS AS DETERMINED FROM
AN INVESTIGATION IN THE LANGLEY
FREE-FLIGHT APPARATUS

By Lawrence J. Gale

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory
Langley Air Force Base, Va.

CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED

CLASSIFIED DOCUMENT

Authority NACA R 72477 Date 9/24/54
9/24/54 See _____
 This document contains classified information under the National Defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act, USC 5031 and 5042. Its transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law. Information so classified may be imparted only to persons in the military and naval establishments of the United States, appropriate civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government who have a legitimate interest therein, and to United States citizens of known loyalty and discretion who of necessity must be informed thereof.

NACA LIBRARY

LANGLEY AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY

Langley Field, Va.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FOR AERONAUTICS

WASHINGTON

May 23, 1950

UNCLASSIFIED



UNCLASSIFIED

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

THE PATH AND MOTION OF SCALE MODELS OF JETTISONABLE NOSE
SECTIONS AT SUPERSONIC SPEEDS AS DETERMINED FROM
AN INVESTIGATION IN THE LANGLEY
FREE-FLIGHT APPARATUS

By Lawrence J. Gale

SUMMARY

An investigation has been conducted on models of two different designs of jettisonable nose sections wherein the nose sections have been projected at supersonic speeds (Mach number ranged from 1.2 to 1.4) in the Langley free-flight apparatus. Both nose designs in the original unstabilized (without-fins) condition turned away from a nose-first flight attitude and calculations indicated that a pilot within corresponding full-scale nose sections would encounter large accelerations (12 negative g for 0.014 second for one nose design and 26 negative g for 0.013 second for the other) as a result of this instability. Both nose designs with fins installed appeared stable, and calculations indicated that the equivalent motion in a corresponding full-scale nose section would not subject the pilot to large accelerations (6 transverse g).

INTRODUCTION

One of the problems confronting airplane designers of high-speed aircraft is safe pilot escape in an emergency. The conventional method of escape utilized from low-speed aircraft appears impractical in airplanes flying at supersonic speeds. A method of pilot escape from high-speed aircraft now being considered is that of jettisoning the nose section of the airplane in which the pilot is seated.

On the basis of results of low-speed investigations (references 1, 2, 3, and unpublished data), it has been determined that jettisonable nose sections not stabilized with fins will turn away from a nose-first flight attitude when released from an airplane. The size fins required to

UNCLASSIFIED

stabilize various nose sections at low speeds has been determined (reference 1). In order to verify the unstable tendencies of nose sections, to check the stabilizing properties of fins when nose sections are jettisoned at supersonic speeds, and to determine whether the motions of the nose jettisoned at such speeds will cause large accelerations on the pilot, an investigation has been conducted in the Langley free-flight apparatus on two typical jettisonable nose sections, each with and without stabilizing fins. The nose sections were projected at Mach numbers ranging from 1.20 to 1.40.

Although the present investigation is concerned only with stabilization of a nose section at supersonic speeds, other test results (references 2 and 3) have shown that the separation of the nose from the remainder of the airplane can also present a serious problem and must be given serious consideration.

SYMBOLS

t	time, seconds
c_0, c_1, c_2	coefficients for cubic equation
s	distance, feet
W	weight, pounds
a	acceleration at center of gravity, feet per second ²
g	gravitational acceleration, feet per second ²
m	mass, slugs
ρ	air density, slugs per cubic foot
A	cross-sectional area of model at break-off station (figs. 1 to 4), square feet
V	flight velocity, feet per second
F	force, pounds
I_x, I_y, I_z	moments of inertia about X, Y, and Z body axes, respectively, slug-feet ²
l	linear dimension, feet

R	scale ratio, ratio of any dimension of full-scale nose section to corresponding dimension of model nose section
r	distance from the center of gravity of a nose section to pilot's head (figs. 1 and 2)
M	Mach number
ω	angular velocity, radians per second
q	angular velocity in pitch, radians per second
K	ratio of velocity of sound at given altitude to velocity of sound at sea level $\left(\frac{V_{alt}}{V_o} \right)_{M=1}$
C_D	drag coefficient

Subscripts:

f_s	full-scale
m	model
alt	altitude
o	sea level

METHODS AND APPARATUS

Apparatus, Testing Technique, and Reduction of Data

The Langley free-flight apparatus is a tank 100 feet in length and 8 feet in diameter containing air or other test gases through which models are projected at high speeds by means of a catapulting mechanism. Precise records of the model time-space coordinates are made. Space values are determined by the use of cameras mounted at 10-foot intervals along the length of the tank and by the use of shadowgraph apparatus located between some of the cameras. Time values are determined by the use of a thermostatic crystal-controlled oscillator which controls timing marks on a cathoderay oscillograph. This oscillograph is photographed by a high-speed camera. At each camera station, two exposures on each film are made as the model

crosses the field of the camera, so as to increase the number of time-space coordinates available for calculations of Mach number and drag coefficients.

When the models are projected, they are guided the length of the catapulting mechanism by means of a balsa cradle; this cradle quickly separates from the model after the model leaves the catapulting mechanism and is considered to have no effect on the subsequent motion of the model.

For each test flight a quadratic equation of the form

$$t = c_0 + c_1 s + c_2 s^2$$

is fitted to the space-time coordinates, for all positions in which the model is detected, by the conventional least-squares methods (reference 4).

The drag coefficient of the nose section in flight can be obtained from the equation

$$C_D = \frac{2Wa}{\rho AV^2}$$

where V is the first time derivative of s , and a is the second. That is

$$V = \frac{1}{c_1 + 2c_2 s}$$

$$a = \frac{-2c_2}{(c_1 + 2c_2 s)^3}$$

Models

The models used during the investigation were scale models of jettisonable nose sections typical of those being incorporated into the design of current transonic and supersonic research aircraft. The models were built and prepared for testing by the Langley Laboratory. Eight models were built, four of each of the two nose designs considered in this investigation. For each design two models were constructed without stabilizing fins and two were constructed incorporating stabilizing fins. The models of each nose design constructed without fins will hereinafter be referred to as models 1 and 2 and the

corresponding designs with fins installed will be referred to as models 3 and 4. The fins installed on models 3 and 4 were curved to the contour of the nose section so that on a full-scale nose section they might be retractable. The size fins used were those found necessary to stabilize the nose sections at low speeds (reference 1).

Drawings of models 1, 2, 3, and 4 which represented each of the two types of nose sections, both with and without stabilizing fins installed, are presented in figures 1 to 4 and photographs of the corresponding models are presented as figures 5 to 8. The scale of the models tested varied from 1/19 to 1/10 depending upon the design and upon whether fins were installed. The different scales were selected so as to obtain models of the maximum size that could be successfully projected in the Langley free-flight apparatus, larger models generally enhancing the probability of obtaining film results.

As indicated in the section entitled "Analysis," the ratio of the density of a full-scale section to the air must be the same as the ratio of the density of a corresponding model to the air. The models without fins installed were ballasted with lead weights to obtain dynamic similarity to corresponding full-scale jettisonable nose sections at a desired test altitude of 15,000 feet. As indicated previously, the models on which fins were incorporated were smaller than those without fins, and when these models were constructed, their structural weight exceeded the desired weight for testing to correspond to a full-scale design at an equivalent altitude of 15,000 feet. Model 3 was ballasted to represent a corresponding nose section at an equivalent test altitude of 50,000 feet and model 4 was ballasted for an equivalent test altitude of 18,700 feet. This increased their respective desired weights for testing to values high enough to permit ballasting. The equivalent test altitude of model 3 was considerably higher than that of the other models because of its extremely small size and associated difficulties in distributing ballast. The weight of the stabilizing fins was included in the desired weights of models 3 and 4. Table I is a presentation of the mass characteristics of the models (given in terms of full-scale values).

Analysis

The equations used in converting model test results to those that would be obtained with a corresponding full-scale nose are herewith presented. Theories of dynamic similitude presented in reference 4 have been modified to apply to models when (1) the Mach number for the model is equal to the Mach number for the full-scale nose section, and (2) a small effect of gravity on the model for a short-time period of model action is neglected.

As pointed out in reference 5, in order for dynamic similitude to exist between a model and a full-scale section, the ratio of the full-scale aerodynamic forces to the model aerodynamic forces must be equal to the ratio of the full-scale inertia forces to the model inertia forces, as indicated in the following equation:

$$\frac{F_{fs}}{F_m} = \frac{l_{fs}^2 v_{fs}^2}{l_m^2 v_m^2} \frac{\rho_{fs}}{\rho_m} = \frac{m_{fs} a_{fs}}{m_m a_m} \quad (1)$$

It should be noted that the term $\frac{\rho_{fs}}{\rho_m}$ was omitted in reference 5 because $\frac{\rho_{fs}}{\rho_m}$ was assumed to be equal to one. Inasmuch as $M_{fs} = M_m$, velocities obtained experimentally at sea level must be multiplied by $K \left(\frac{\text{Velocity of sound at altitude}}{\text{Velocity of sound at sea level}} \right)$ in order to obtain velocities at test altitude. This correction is necessary because of the fact that the speed of sound at sea level is greater than the speed of sound obtained as the altitude is increased. Let $\frac{l_{fs}}{l_m} = R$. Substitution of $\frac{l_{fs}}{l_m} = R$ and $\frac{v_{fs}}{v_m} = K$ in equation (1) results in

$$R^2 K^2 \frac{\rho_{fs}}{\rho_m} = \frac{m_{fs} a_{fs}}{m_m a_m}$$

or

$$\frac{a_{fs}}{a_m} = \frac{m_m}{m_{fs}} R^2 K^2 \frac{\rho_{fs}}{\rho_m} \quad (2)$$

In order to determine the relationship for acceleration between the model and the corresponding full-scale section from equation (2), it is necessary to determine the relationship existing between the corresponding mass terms.

As indicated in reference 5, in order that both model and full-scale section have similar motion, they must have similar helix angles. That is

$$\frac{\omega_{fs} l_{fs}}{v_{fs}} = \frac{\omega_m l_m}{v_m} \quad (3)$$

Then, since $\frac{V_{fs}}{V_m} = K$ and $\frac{l_{fs}}{l_m} = R$,

$$\omega_{fs} = \frac{\omega_m K}{R} \quad (4)$$

Since centripetal acceleration is $\omega^2 l$

$$\frac{l_{fs}^2 V_{fs}^2 \rho_{fs}}{l_m^2 V_m^2 \rho_m} = \frac{m_{fs} \omega_{fs}^2 l_{fs}}{m_m \omega_m^2 l_m} \quad (5)$$

Then

$$\frac{m_{fs}}{m_m} = R^3 \frac{\rho_{fs}}{\rho_m} \quad (6)$$

It can be seen that equation (6) expresses the necessary condition that the ratio of the density of a full-scale section to that of air equals the ratio of the density of the corresponding model to that of air, since

$$\frac{m_{fs}}{\rho_{fs} l_{fs}^3} = \frac{m_m}{\rho_m l_m^3}$$

or

$$\frac{m_{fs}}{m_m} = R^3 \frac{\rho_{fs}}{\rho_m}$$

Substituting for the mass term in equation (2):

$$a_{fs} = \frac{a_m K^2}{R} \quad (7)$$

Similarly, other relations are:

$$t_{fs} = t_m \frac{R}{K}$$

$$I_{fs} = I_m R^5 \frac{\rho_{fs}}{\rho_m}$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As mentioned previously, two models were built of each design and configuration. Both sets of results are presented for model 1, the second set being referred to as results for model 1a. Only one set of results was obtained for model 2 and for model 4 because the alternate firings of these models were unsuccessful. Two sets of results were obtained for model 3 but because of their similarity only one set is presented herein.

The results of the present investigation are presented in figures 9 to 14 in the form of photographs of the models in flight taken at various stations along their flight path. Table II is a presentation of measurements accurately locating the model in each picture, a timing record, and results of calculations made to determine the Mach number at the points at which the photographs of figures 9 to 14 were obtained. The letter "a" adjacent to each station number on table II indicates the first exposure on each film, and "b" the second exposure (if one were obtained). These measurements and calculations are believed to be accurate to 1 percent.

Figures 9 and 10 indicate that models 1 and 1a, which were identically similar and had no stabilizing fins, were unstable. Model 1 pitched up when projected and model 1a pitched down when projected; the rate of pitch of the models appeared to be practically the same in each case. Calculations made for model 1 to determine the largest accelerations which would act on a pilot during the flight of a corresponding airplane nose indicate that due to the pitching motion which between stations 4b and 6a was approximately a 63° rotation (from 12° to 75° incidence) in a period of time of 0.135 second (full-scale at 15,000 ft altitude) there would occur a full-scale centripetal acceleration q^2r of approximately 4.3g. The component of this acceleration acting along the backbone of the pilot would be approximately 3.3g. Between stations 6a and 6b, the nose pointed up approximately 75° to the direction of flight and, due to the associated drag rise, the linear acceleration acting along the backbone of the pilot in a corresponding airplane nose at an altitude of 15,000 feet would be 12.1g for 0.014 second. For the case (model 1) in which the nose turned up, the corresponding acceleration on a pilot sitting erect would be positive and could probably be withstood. If, however, it noses down as it did for model 1a, the acceleration would be negative. Reference 6 indicates the possible danger of such a negative acceleration although it has been indicated that recent experience by the Air Force points to the possibility that man's tolerance of negative acceleration may be greater than the limits shown in reference 6. The time history of the forward movement of model 1a appeared to be generally similar to that of model 1 and is not presented in tabular form.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

When model 2, the other nose section without fins, was projected in the Langley free-flight apparatus, it too turned away from a nose-first flight attitude (fig. 11). Calculations indicated that although the centripetal acceleration due to rotation of a corresponding full-scale nose section would not be large, the deceleration along the flight path associated with the drag rise when the nose turned away from a nose-first attitude would again be large. For example, between stations 4a and 4b the nose pointed down approximately 90° to the flight path, and a pilot in a corresponding full-scale nose section at 15,000 feet altitude would undergo a high negative acceleration of 26.4g for a period of time of 0.013 seconds. It can be observed in figure 11 that model 2 started to disintegrate at station 5, probably because of faulty model construction.

When models 3 and 4, the fin-stabilized versions of models 1 and 2, respectively, were projected in the Langley free-flight apparatus, they were quite stable in flight as indicated by figures 12 to 14. Figure 13 is a shadowgraph of model 3 in flight and shows the flow pattern around the stabilized nose. The acceleration a pilot would receive in a stable full-scale nose section would act transversely where the human tolerance to acceleration is greatest. Calculations indicated that the corresponding motion in the full-scale nose section would not subject the pilot to large accelerations (approx. 3.5g full-scale for model 3 and approx. 5.9g full-scale for model 4 based on stations midway in the free-flight apparatus). It is felt that the rather large descent of model 4 in flight as compared with model 3 was caused by the fact that one or more of the fins of model 4 may have been damaged in launching. The drag coefficient obtained for model 3 was 0.943 at a Mach number of 1.199 and for model 4 the drag coefficient obtained was 0.603 at a Mach number of 1.177. Calculations of drag coefficient were not made for the unstable nose sections because an accurate enough time and angular displacement history of the rotation of the nose was not obtained to permit accurate calculations.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the present investigation in which scale models of jettisonable nose sections of current research aircraft were projected at supersonic speeds in the Langley free-flight apparatus indicate that unstabilized nose sections will turn away from a nose-first flight attitude, and calculations indicate that a pilot within a corresponding full-scale nose section may encounter large accelerations as a result of this instability. When nose sections are stabilized with fins, they will continue in a stable nose-first attitude and calculations have

indicated that the corresponding motion in the full-scale nose section would not subject the pilot to large accelerations.

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics
Langley Air Force Base, Va.

REFERENCES

1. Scher, Stanley H.: An Empirical Criterion for Fin Stabilizing Jettisonable Nose Sections of Airplanes. NACA RM L9I28, 1949.
2. Scher, Stanley H., and Gale, Lawrence J.: Motion of a Transonic Airplane Nose Section When Jettisoned As Determined from Wind-Tunnel Investigations on a $\frac{1}{25}$ -Scale Model. NACA RM L9L08a, 1950.
3. Goodwin, Roscoe H.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation at Low Speed to Determine Aerodynamic Properties of a Jettisonable Nose Section with a Circular Cross Section. NACA RM L9J13, 1950.
4. Crout, Prescott D.: A Short Method for Evaluating Determinants and Solving Systems of Linear Equations with Real or Complex Coefficients. Trans. AIEE, vol. 60, 1941, pp. 1235-1240.
5. Scherberg, Max, and Rhode, R. V.: Mass Distribution and Performance of Free Flight Models. NACA TN 268, 1927.
6. Lombard, Charles F.: How Much Force Can Body Withstand? Aviation Week, vol. 50, no. 3, Jan. 17, 1949, pp. 20-28.

TABLE I.- MASS CHARACTERISTICS AND EQUIVALENT TEST ALTITUDE OF
MODELS OF JETTISONABLE NOSE SECTIONS INVESTIGATED IN THE
LANGLEY FREE-FLIGHT APPARATUS

[Model values converted to corresponding full-scale values;
moments of inertia are given about center of gravity]

Model	Weight (lb)	Moments of inertia (slug-ft ²)			Equivalent altitude at which tested (ft)
		I _X	I _Y	I _Z	
1	727	27.1	81.2	71.7	15,000
2	977	24.1	129.3	126.0	15,000
3	1019	48.8	60.7	60.7	50,000
4	1062	55.4	182.7	185.5	18,700

NACA

TABLE II.- PERTINENT DATA OF THE FLIGHT OF MODELS OF JETTISONABLE
NOSE SECTIONS INVESTIGATED IN THE LANGLEY FREE-FLIGHT APPARATUS

[All values are model values at sea level.]

Station	Displacement of nose point from end of catapulting mechanism (ft)	Time (sec)	Mach number	Photographs presented in figure
Model 1				
1a	8.731	0.0000	1.347	9
1b	11.905	.0022	1.332	
2b	21.226	.0085	1.290	
4a	40.116	.0219	1.213	
4b	41.689	.0231	1.207	
5a	50.715	.0299	1.173	
6a	58.165	.0359	1.147	
6b	59.684	.0372	1.141	

Speed of sound during test, 1115 ft per sec.

Model 2				
1a	8.902	.0000	1.418	11
1b	12.148	.0021	1.381	
2a	20.356	.0077	1.297	
2b	21.376	.0084	1.281	
4a	39.981	.0217	1.132	
4b	41.365	.0228	1.122	
5a	49.433	.0296	1.067	
5b	50.381	.0303	1.060	

Speed of sound during test, 1134 ft per sec.

Model 3				
1a	8.366	.0000	1.237	12
1b	11.454	.0022	1.231	
2a	20.105	.0085	1.214	13
2b	20.649	.0091	1.212	
Shadowgraph	23.958	.0113	1.207	12
3a	28.428	.0146	1.199	
4a	39.969	.0231	1.178	
4b	41.661	.0244	1.175	
5a	47.949	.0291	1.164	
5b	51.169	.0312	1.159	

Speed of sound during test, 1132 ft per sec.

Model 4				
1a	8.564	.0000	1.227	14
1b	11.620	.0022	1.220	
2a	20.179	.0085	1.200	
3a	28.472	.0147	1.182	
3b	30.703	.0164	1.177	
4a	37.719	.0217	1.161	
4b	41.095	.0242	1.154	
7a	71.854	.0486	1.093	

Speed of sound during test, 1127 ft per sec.






Figure 1.- Drawing of $\frac{1}{10}$ -scale model 1. (Pilot's head in a corresponding full-scale nose section located 1.34 ft aft and 1.60 ft above center of gravity.)




Figure 2.- Drawing of $\frac{1}{11}$ -scale model 2. (Pilot's head in a corresponding full-scale nose section located 0.51 ft aft and 1.08 ft above center of gravity.)




Figure 3.- Drawing of $\frac{1}{19}$ -scale model 3.





Figure 4.- Drawing of $\frac{1}{15}$ -scale model 4.






Figure 5.- Photograph of model 1.




Figure 6.- Photograph of model 2.




Figure 7.- Photograph of model 3.






Figure 8.- Photograph of model 4.



Station 1



Station 2



Station 4



Station 5



Station 6

Direction of travel



NACA
L-63041

Figure 9.- Motion of model 1 when projected at supersonic speeds in the Langley free-flight apparatus. (Camera at station 3 failed.)



Station 1



Station 2



Station 3



Station 4



Station 5

Direction of travel



NACA
L-63042

Figure 10.- Motion of model 1a when projected at supersonic speeds in the Langley free-flight apparatus.

• What is the purpose of the document?

• What are the main points?

• What are the main points?

•

•

•


•



Station 1



Station 2



Station 4



Station 5

Direction of travel

NACA
L-63043

Figure 11.- Motion of model 2 when projected at supersonic speeds in the Langley free-flight apparatus. (Camera at station 3 failed.)




Station 1



Station 2



Station 3



Station 4



Station 5

NACA
L-63044

Direction of travel



Figure 12.- Motion of model 3 when projected at supersonic speeds in the Langley free-flight apparatus.

CONFIDENTIAL




Figure 13.- Shadowgraph of model 3 in flight. Mach number, 1.21.



Station 1



Station 2



Station 3



Station 4



Station 7

NACA
L-63045

Direction of travel



Figure 14.- Motion of model 4 when projected at supersonic speeds in the Langley free-flight apparatus. (Cameras at stations 5 and 6 failed.)

NASA Technical Library



3 1176 01436 6919